Filed: 10/13/2003

Attorney Docket No.: LOT920030025US1 (7321-010U)

REMARKS

Introduction

These remarks are set forth in response to the New Non-Final Office Action. As this amendment has been timely filed within the three-month statutory period, neither an extension of time nor a fee is required. Presently, claims 1 through 22 are pending in the Patent Application. Claims 1, 6 and 16 are independent in nature.

- (1) In the Non-Final Office Action, claims 6, 7, 12, 14, 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20040195035 by Chakraborty et al. (Chakraborty).
- (2) Additionally, claims 1 through 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20020152234 by Estrada et al. (Estrada) in view of Chakraborty.
- (3) Yet further, claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Estrada in view of Chakraborty and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0202349 by Erol et al. (Erol).
- (4) Even yet further, claims 8, 9, 15, 18, 19 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chakraborty in view of Erol.
- (5) Finally, claims 10, 11, 13, 20 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chakraborty in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,162,691 to Chatterjee et al. (Chatterjee).

In response, the Applicants have amended claims 6 and 16 and respectfully traverse the rejections on the art.

Filed: 10/13/2003

Attorney Docket No.: LOT920030025US1 (7321-010U)

II. The Applicants' Invention

The Applicants have invented a system, method and apparatus for converting a slide show presentation for use within a non-presentation application such as a Web conferencing or virtual classroom application. In the Applicants' invention, a slide show presentation in its native format can be processed to extract slide title information for each slide in the slide show presentation. Additionally, important text within in slide further can be extracted. Each slide in the slide-show can be converted to a raster image and disposed within markup. The markup can be annotated with the important text and both the markup and the slide title can be provided to the non-presentation application for use in concert with the non-presentation application. In this way, the context of each slide can be preserved for use within the non-presentation application as can an image of each slide itself.

III. Rejections on the Art

Characterization of Chakraborty

Chakraborty generally relates systems and methods for processing electronic documents. In Chakraborty form information is extracted from raster-based passive documents, for example, and using such form information for applications such as content cross-referencing between related multimedia documents within an electronic document publishing environment. As taught in Chakraborty, a form information extraction process includes analyzing an electronic document (e.g., a PDF document) which is created in any fashion (e.g., scan, OCR, etc.) to perform document understanding (e.g., segment text and images) and then extract form information

Application No. 10/685,192

Filed: 10/13/2003

Attorney Docket No.: LOT920030025US1 (7321-010U)

associated with text portion and/or non-text portions (e.g., images) within the electronic document. The extracted form information is then stored in a structured format that follows a predefined syntax and grammar (e.g., an XML or SGML file with a prespecified DTD).

B. Amendments to Claims 6 and 14

Applicants have amended claims 6 and 14 to make painfully clear that a slide title is extracted for a first slide in a slide show presentation produced by a slide show presentation application. This claim amendment is supported by the first three paragraphs of the Detailed Description of the Invention in the Patent Application.

Accordingly, no new matter has been added by virtue of these amendments.

C. Traversal of the Examiner's Rejections

Claim 1 as originally filed expressly recites as follows:

- A system for converting slide show presentations for use within nonpresentation applications, the system comprising:
- a slide show produced by a slide show presentation application and stored in a native format; and,
- a slide show conversion process configured for coupling to a non-presentation application and programmed both to extract contextual data from said slide show in its native format, and also to convert associated slides in said slide show to raster imagery for use in said non-presentation application.

The bolded and underlined portions are wholly absent in the combination of Chakraborty and Estrada.

Chakraborty for its part entirely lacks any teaching relating to a "slide show", a
"slide show presentation application", or a "slide". Rather, Chakraborty only teaches the
extraction of text from a PDF when reading a PDF form. Estrada, in turn, teaches only

Application No. 10/685,192

Filed: 10/13/2003

Attorney Docket No.: LOT920030025US1 (7321-010U)

the conversion of a slide in a slide show into an HTML document. In order to satisfy a prima facie case of obviousness under M.P.E.P. 2143, the Examiner must locate every recited element of the rejected claim in the references as cited. In this case, the Examiner has not located the extraction of contextual data from said slide show in its native format. Rather, the Examiner merely has located the extraction of data from a PDF file.

Claims 6 and 16 as amended recite as follows:

- A method for converting a slide show presentation for use within a nonpresentation application, the method comprising the steps of: extracting a slide title for a first slide in a slide show presentation produced by a slide show presentation application;
- converting said first slide into a raster image:
- disposing both said slide title and said raster image in a markup language
- repeating said extracting, converting and disposing steps for a selected group of other slides in the slide show presentation.

Again, Chakraborty entirely lacks a teaching--even a hint of a teaching--directed to the extraction of a "slide" title for a "slide" in a "slide show presentation".

The Examiner has glossed over this lack of a teaching in repeating only the teaching of an "electronic document" while interjecting that

Inherently the steps of extracting, converting and disposing would be repeated for all selected group of slides within the slide show presentation

(New Non-Final Office Action, Page 4, Paragraph 2, last sentence) The Examiner is to be reminded, however, that under M.P.E.P. 2131, to establish a prima facie case of anticipation, the Examiner must locate every explicitly claimed element in the cited reference. See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)("A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."). In this regard, the Applicants rely upon M.P.E.P. 2111.01 in

Application No. 10/685,192

Filed: 10/13/2003

Attorney Docket No.: LOT920030025US1 (7321-010U)

which it is stated with precision that claim terms under examination are to be afforded

their clear, plain meaning. See Chef America, Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc., 358 F.3d 1371,

1372, 69 USPQ2d 1857 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (Ordinary, simple English words whose

meaning is clear and unquestionable, absent any indication that their use in a particular

context changes their meaning, are construed to mean exactly what they say). Clearly,

"slide show" can only be interpreted according to its plain meaning and cannot be

extended to PDF document shown in Chakrabortv.

IV. Conclusion

To that end, the Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections

under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a) owing to the foregoing remarks. The Applicants

request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter

within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would

expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted.

Date: September 5, 2007

/Steven M. Greenberg/

Steven M. Greenberg, Reg. No.: 44,725

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Carey, Rodriguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP

950 Peninsula Corporate Circle, Suite 3020 Boca Raton, FL 33487

Customer No. 46321

Tel: (561) 922-3845

Fax: (561) 244-1062

12